

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 7-10 and 22-30 are pending in this application. By this amendment, Applicant amends claims 7, 22, and 30.

The Examiner rejected claims 7-10 and 22-30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Aoshima et al. (U.S. 6,241,524) in view of Iwamura et al. (U.S. 6,388,684). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of Claims 7-10 and 22-30.

Claim 7 has been amended to recite:

A game device for proceeding a game by placing game objects related to the game in a three-dimensional virtual space and by controlling said objects, comprising:

**first game proceeding means for proceeding the game by controlling said game objects in a first game field in said three-dimensional virtual space;**

**second game proceeding means for proceeding the game by controlling said game objects in a second game field in said three-dimensional virtual space;**

cursor object forming means for forming a cursor object indicating a certain area of one of said first and second game fields as well as an area of the other game field corresponding to the certain area; and

**perspective transformation display means for forming a screen picture on a display by transforming coordinates of each object including said cursor object within view of a viewpoint located in said three-dimensional virtual space; wherein**

**the cursor object is a three-dimensional object extending over both of the first game field and the second game field; and**

**a grid is arranged on the first and second game fields, respectively, and the cursor object connects between a first area designated on the grid on the first game field and a second area designated on the grid on the second game field by extending over the first and second areas. (emphasis added)**

Applicant's Claims 22 and 30 recite features and method steps that are similar to the features recited in Applicant's Claim 7, including the above-emphasized features.

The Examiner alleged that Aoshima et al. teaches all of the features and method steps recited in each of independent Claims 7, 22, and 30, except for the feature of the cursor object being a three-dimensional object that extends over both of the first game field and the second game field in the three-dimensional virtual space. The Examiner further alleged, "In a similar environment, Iwamura [et al.] teaches the use of a 3D

cursor object used to display computer image target (figs 1a-1c el. 26, 25). Iwamura [et al.] further teaches the cursor to be a three-dimensional object extending over a first field and a second field (figs 1a-1c el. 26, 25, i.e. the target such as a location on the ground/map, and the field above the map/ground)." Thus, the Examiner concluded that it would have been obvious "to incorporate Iwamura's teachings wherein the motivation is to provide a three-dimensional target identifying means that displays a target through a viewing window making it easier for the user to aim and shoot." Applicant respectfully disagrees.

First, Aoshima et al. fails to teach or suggest two game fields respectively proceeding a game. Cols. 5 and 7 and Figs. 5 and 9 of Aoshima et al., which the Examiner alleged teach two game fields, merely teach performing the same game in the same game field. Fig. 3 of Aoshima et al. teaches a game field 60 having a plurality of platforms 66, 76, and 78, but all of these platforms form a single game field in which a single futuristic tank 500 is moved. Aoshima et al. fails to teach or suggest a first game field and a second game field.

Iwamura et al. teaches two map areas, however, one of the map areas is merely an enlarged image of the other map area (see, for example, the Abstract of Iwamura et al.). In other words, both images of the map areas are images of the same game field. Iwamura et al. neither teaches nor suggest first and second game fields.

Thus, contrary to the Examiner's allegations, Aoshima et al. and Iwamura et al. fail to teach or suggest the features of "first game proceeding means for proceeding the game by controlling said game objects in a first game field in said three-dimensional virtual space" and "second game proceeding means for proceeding the game by controlling said game objects in a second game field in said three-dimensional virtual space" as recited in Applicant's Claim 7, and similarly in Applicant's Claims 22 and 30.

Second, neither Aoshima et al. nor Iwamura et al. teaches or suggests a perspective transformation display means for forming a screen picture by transforming the coordinates of each object in first and second game fields. Although Aoshima et al. discloses in cols. 5 and 9 the perspective transformation of coordinates in the three-dimensional game space 400, this transformation is only performed once for a single

game field in a single virtual three-dimensional space.

Each map area in Iwamura et al. is merely a two-dimensional map. Iwamura et al. fails to teach or suggest any three-dimensional space, and certainly fails to teach or suggest any perspective transformation display means for transforming coordinates of each object within view of a viewpoint located in a three-dimensional virtual space.

Thus, Aoshima et al. and Iwamura et al. fail to teach or suggest the feature of "perspective transformation display means for forming a screen picture on a display by transforming coordinates of each object including said cursor object within view of a viewpoint located in said three-dimensional virtual space" as recited in Applicant's Claim 7, and similarly in Applicant's Claims 22 and 30.

Third, as acknowledged by the Examiner, Aoshima et al. fails to teach or suggest a cursor object being a three-dimensional object extending over both of the first and second game fields. In addition, contrary to the Examiner's allegations, Iwamura et al. also fails to teach or suggest such a cursor object.

As noted above, Iwamura et al. fails to teach or suggest a first game field and a second game field, and certainly fails to teach or suggest the feature of "the cursor object is a three-dimensional object extending over both of the first game field and the second game field" as recited in Applicant's Claim 7, and similarly in Applicant's Claims 22 and 30. Elements 26 and 25 of Iwamura et al., which the Examiner alleged correspond to the cursor object recited in Applicant's Claims 7, 22, and 30, are disclosed as being an entire display region and an enlarged image display region, and have absolutely nothing at all to do with a cursor object.

Finally, in order to further distinguish the present claimed invention over the applied prior art, Applicant's Claim 7 has been amended to recite the feature of "a grid is arranged on the first and second game fields, respectively, and the cursor object connects between a first area designated on the grid on the first game field and a second area designated on the grid on the second game field by extending over the first and second areas." Applicant's Claim 22 and 30 have been similarly amended. Support for this feature is found, for example, in the paragraph bridging pages 32 and 33 and Figs. 13 and 14 of the originally filed application.

Aoshima et al. and Iwamura et al. fail to teach or suggest any grid arranged on a game field, and certainly fail to teach or suggest the feature of "a grid is arranged on the first and second game fields, respectively, and the cursor object connects between a first area designated on the grid on the first game field and a second area designated on the grid on the second game field by extending over the first and second areas" as recited in Applicant's Claim 7, and similarly in Applicant's Claims 22 and 30.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Aoshima et al. and Iwamura et al., applied alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the unique combination and arrangement of elements recited in Claims 7, 22, and 30 of the present application.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 7, 22, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Aoshima et al. in view of Iwamura et al.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 7, 22, and 30 are allowable. Claims 8-10 and 23-29 depend upon Claims 7 and 22, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that Claims 7 and 22 are allowable.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 23, 2008

/Christopher A. Bennett #46,710/  
Attorneys for Applicant

**KEATING & BENNETT, LLP**  
8180 Greensboro Drive, Suite 850  
Tyson's Corner, VA 22102  
Telephone: (703) 637-1480  
Facsimile: (703) 637-1499

Joseph R. Keating  
Registration No. 37,368  
  
Christopher A. Bennett  
Registration No. 46,710